

**REMARKS:**

This paper is herewith filed in response to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on February 8, 2008 for the above-captioned U.S. Patent Application. Prior to entry of this Amendment, claims 1-28 were pending. By the Amendment herewith, claims 11, 19-25 and 27 are clarified to improve upon the wording. These amendments are not made for reasons related to patentability and the full range of equivalents should remain in tact. New dependent claim 29 also is added as supported throughout the specification and by original claim 6. No new matter is introduced into the application.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-6, 10-15 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elg (WO99/37106) in view of Gauffin (US 5,517,499). Claims 7-9, 16-18 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elg in view of Gauffin and Muller (US 6,959,013).

The foregoing rejections are respectfully disagreed with, and are traversed below.

Gauffin discloses an arrangement for synchronising two or more individual communication networks in order to form a composite network. Fig. 1 illustrates a composite network which includes nodes N1 to N5 and buses B1 to B6. Since N1 is located at the beginning of all buses, it is assigned the role of superior master node. N1 also is assigned the role of master node of B1 and B2. N2 is assigned the role of master of B3, N3 is assigned the role of master of B4, N4 is assigned the role of master of B5 and N5 is assigned the role of master of B6. N2 is a member of B2 and N3, N5 are members of B1.

The superior master node N1 controls the synchronisation of master nodes N2 to N5 by transmitting a triggering pattern. When this pattern reaches a master node (one of the nodes N2 to N5), this node knows that a new time frame has begun. The master node then starts the frame on the bus for which it is master (i.e. B3 to B6) by transmitting a triggering pattern TM downstream.

The subsequent portion of the time frame 'D' is used for the communication of data between nodes. Then, after an idle pattern TOM, the superior master node N1 transmits another triggering pattern TM to start a new time frame on each of the networks.

The superior master node N1 stores the idle pattern TOM. The idle pattern is long enough to allow all master nodes N2 to N5 to end their transmission in time for receiving the next triggering pattern TM.

Gauffin does not disclose a means for punctuating the series of messages of a first type with messages of a second type, transmitted within the network of transceivers, for maintaining synchronization, as recited in Applicant's independent claim 1. Nor does this reference disclose a controller configured for punctuating a series of messages of a first type with messages of a second type, transmitted within the network of transceivers, for maintaining synchronization, as recited in Applicant's independent claim 10. Similarly, Gauffin does not disclose Applicant's corresponding independent method claim 10, nor the storage medium encoded with instructions that, when executed by a controller of a low power radio frequency transceiver perform punctuating transmission of a series of messages of a first type comprising a first synchronization word independent of the identity of the low power radio frequency transceiver, with message of a second type, as recited in independent claim 11.

Gauffin does not disclose messages of a first type which are transmitted outside a network of low power radio frequency transceivers. Gauffin discloses that the superior master node and the master nodes only transmit messages within their own networks. Consequently, Gauffin does not disclose that messages which are transmitted outside a network are punctuated with messages which are transmitted within the network.

For example, the superior master node N1 transmits a triggering pattern TM on its own networks, i.e. buses B1 and B2. Since master nodes N2, N3 and N5 are connected to buses B1 and B2, these nodes then transmit the triggering pattern on their networks (B3, B4 and B6). The superior

master node N1 never transmits triggering patterns TM outside its own network of nodes (for example, it never transmits a message directly to node N4). Additionally, the data 'D' cannot be considered 'messages of a first type' because the data 'D' is also not transmitted by the superior master node N1 outside the network of the superior master node N1.

As Gauffin does not disclose or suggest, for example, a controller "configured for punctuating the series of messages of a first type with messages of a second type, transmitted within the network of transceivers, for maintaining synchronization," it would not be obvious, or indeed possible, to combine the teachings of Elg and Gauffin to fall within the scope of the independent claims. Furthermore, Gauffin is concerned with a wired network (the nodes are all connected to one another via buses). Embodiments of the invention are concerned with networks of low power radio frequency transceivers. A person skilled in the art would not be motivated to look to Gauffin for guidance. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that Applicant's claims cannot be rendered obvious by any combination of Elg and Gauffin.

Similarly, the addition of the remaining secondary reference, Muller, which discloses a transmitter for transmitting an intermittent sequence of messages, also does not disclose or suggest all of the features of the afore-referenced independent claims whether viewed alone or in combination with Gauffin and/or Elg.

Accordingly, as pending independent claims 1, 10, 11 and 19 are believed to be patentable, remaining dependent claim 2-9, 12-18 and 20-29 also are believed to be in condition for allowance in view of their dependency from an allowable independent claim.

In view of the foregoing, it is asserted that there is no reason to combine and modify the cited references in an attempt to arrive at the subject claims. All claims are believed to patentably distinguish over the cited art. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

S.N.: 10/501,249  
Art Unit: 2618

However, should the Examiner maintain his position, the Examiner is respectfully requested to explain his analysis in more detail. The undersigned attorney also welcomes the opportunity to resolve any matters that may remain, formal or otherwise, via teleconference at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted:

Christine Wilkes Beninati      May 8, 2008

Christine Wilkes Beninati  
Reg. No.: 37,967  
Customer No.: 29683  
HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212  
Telephone: (203)925-9400  
Facsimile: (203)944-0245

Date

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

May 8, 2008      Debra Beninati  
Date      Name of Person Making Deposit